

O

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11	BENNETT VINSON, on behalf)	Case No. EDCV 14-00369 DDP (AGRx)
12	of himself and al others)	
12	similarly situated,)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THIS
13	Plaintiff,)	ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED
14	v.)	FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION
15	ASSET MANAGEMENT)	
16	SPECIALISTS, INC.,)	
17	Defendant.)	

Plaintiff is ordered to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff filed the instant Complaint on February 26, 2014 on the basis of diversity jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332. A federal court has original jurisdiction when there is complete diversity between the parties and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Complete diversity means that each of the plaintiffs must be a citizen of a different state than each of the defendants. Caterpillar Inc. v. Lewis, 519 U.S. 61, 68 (1996).

Here, Defendant's citizenship is not clear from the face of Plaintiff's Complaint. "A corporation shall be deemed to be a

1 citizen of any State by which it has been incorporated and the
2 State where it has its principal place of business." 28 U.S.C.
3 1332(c)(1). Plaintiff's Complaint alleges that Defendant's
4 headquarters are in Pennsylvania, but makes no mention of
5 Defendant's place of incorporation. The court is therefore unable
6 to ascertain Defendant's citizenship, and, thus, whether the
7 parties are diverse.

8 Also, it is not clear that the amount in controversy exceeds
9 the \$75,000 jurisdictional minimum. In class actions such as this
10 one, each named plaintiff must independently meet the amount-in-
11 controversy requirement. See Bernal v. Comerica Bank, 2010 WL
12 3037259, at *3 (C.D. Cal. July 30, 2010). While the Complaint
13 seeks compensatory damages that include lost wages, earnings, and
14 employee benefits, Plaintiff's Complaint does not specify a
15 particular amount of damages and does not indicate whether damages
16 will amount to a sum greater than \$75,000.

17 Accordingly, the court orders Plaintiff to file a brief, not
18 to exceed five pages, within 10 days of the date of this Order,
19 showing why this action should not be dismissed for lack of subject
20 matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff should also deliver a courtesy copy
21 to chambers, Room 244-J, Second Floor, 312 N. Spring Street, Los
22 Angeles. The court will regard any failure to file an explanatory
23 brief as consent to dismiss this matter.

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: April 2, 2014



26 DEAN D. PREGERSON
27 United States District Judge
28